

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California Baptist University

Professional Services Division

April 6, 2000

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at California Baptist University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for California Baptist University and all of its credential programs:
ACCREDITATION

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential
CLAD Emphasis
- Single Subject Credential
CLAD Emphasis
- Education Specialist Credential
Level I Mild/Moderate
- Administrative Services Credential
Preliminary

- (2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California Baptist University be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California Baptist University be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2005-2006 academic year.

Background Information

The Los Angeles Baptist Association started California Baptist College in 1950 in El Monte, California with 120 liberal arts education students. Five years later, the college relocated to its present seventy-five-acre location in Riverside that includes classrooms, campus housing, a library, offices, maintenance and athletic facilities. The institution became a university in September 1998.

The Education Department is the largest of fourteen departments at the university. Of the approximately 2000 total student enrollment, 400 are in the Multiple and Single Subject CLAD Credential and/or Masters Degree programs. The Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate and Administrative Services, Preliminary Level Credential Programs each have approximately twenty students.

Classroom space, residence halls, and office space are being used at capacity, with additional space needed to accommodate potential future growth which is expected, especially in the Teacher Preparation Programs. The university has an off-campus site in Hesperia, California that is being phased out with its final eleven students completing a Multiple Subject Credential Program. After two years' operation, the Hesperia enrollment did not meet the expected numbers due to competing universities in the area.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Spring 1998 and had telephone conversations with the department chair and credential analyst in preparation for a formal meeting with the faculty which was held during the Summer of 1999. Subsequent meetings between the consultant and faculty, program directors, and institutional administration were held as needed. The initial meeting led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, and logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone, e-mail, and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader, Dr. Ed Kujawa, was selected in August 1999. The team size was agreed upon in August as well.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to the credential programs. This was followed by separate responses to the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Program Standards. The institution decided to use option three (General Program Standards) in the *Accreditation Framework* for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs. All other programs used option one (California Program Standards).

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively among the department chair, education faculty and staff, and the Commission consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of nine, consisting of a team leader, three cluster leaders and 5 team members. The Commission consultant selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience, and adaptability, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The COA team leader and members examined the college responses to the Common Standards and the program standards. The on-site phase of the review began on Monday, April 3, 2000. The team arrived on Monday afternoon and began deliberations with one another. The team meeting included a review of the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for the COA team members.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, April 4 and 5, 2000, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. There was extensive consultation among the team members with much sharing of information. Lunch on Tuesday and Wednesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Tuesday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. The mid-visit report was scheduled for 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday. The team had questions and concerns focused on the need for more data. The faculty and staff worked very hard Wednesday afternoon to obtain and present additional information for the team. Wednesday evening was set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. The team completed writing the report on Wednesday evening, and presented it to the faculty and administration at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the Common Standards were "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard.

The team prepared a narrative report about the program standards which pointed out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

After the report was drafted, the team met Wednesday evening for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit. The team discussed each Common Standard and each Program Standard and decided on the basis of interviews and program documents that six of the eight Common Standards were fully met, all of the General Standards used in the Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs were fully met, all of the standards of the Administrative Services Credential Program were fully met and all of the Special Education Standards were fully met. Based on all the data collected and analyzed, the team decided that the Accreditation Status should be "Accreditation."

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

Institution: California Baptist University

Dates of Visit: April 3 - 6, 2000

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** ACCREDITATION

Rationale:

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the unit was based upon a thorough review and discussion of the common standards and program standards.

Team Leader

Ed Kujawa
University of San Diego

Common Standards

John Yoder
Fresno Pacific University

Basic Credential Cluster

Doug Robinson, Cluster Leader
Simi Valley Unified School District

Bernard Strickmeier
California Polytechnic State University

Carol Whitmer
Simpson College

Robert O'Connor
ABC Unified School District

Advanced Credential Cluster

Dreda Lutz, Cluster Leader
Glendale Unified School District

Bill Oudegeest
Oakdale Joint Unified School District

Beth Brennan,
St. Mary's College of California

DATA SOURCES

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
21	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
4	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
148	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
57	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
10	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
26	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
5	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
15	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
1	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
1	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
		X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae
		X	WASC Report

Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Standard Met

California Baptist University has grown significantly from its beginning as a college in 1950. Since the arrival of the current president, Dr. Ronald Ellis, in 1994, the university's enrollment has grown from about 800 students to its present enrollment of about 2000. The institution changed its name from "college" to "university" in 1998. The professional programs for preparing teachers began in the 1960's and have also grown significantly presently enrolling about 350 students each semester. All together, the education related programs, including masters degrees, account for about half of the university's student enrollment. The university president indicates that he considers education to be a flagship program of the university. The Education Department and the Division of Education, in which the department is located, have articulated a clear vision and commitment to quality programming that is highly student oriented.

Strengths

- The university's upper level administration (President, Academic Vice President) has a background in education which gives them an appreciation for and good understanding of the education programs.
- The education programs are widely praised for their high standards and their commitment to helping their students succeed.

Concerns

- Adopting the university name does not yet seem to be reflected in the organizational and administrative structures of the university. While the upper level and central administrative structures and responsibilities are clearly defined this clarity is less obvious in the middle levels where the relationships between title (e.g. CLAD Coordinator or Single Subject Coordinator) and responsibilities are not always clear.
- Academic policies and decision making at the program level often appear to be vested in one individual.

Standard 2: Resources

Standard Minimally Met Qualitative Concerns

The resources are adequate in some areas. This includes clerical and support staff, computer facilities for students, and technology support for teachers. There are, however, several concerns about the library, the freezing of the budget during the academic year and faculty load. The library was mentioned a number of times as having outdated materials and limited resources to support the credential programs. The budget freeze in each of the past two years has resulted in a climate of uncertainty in terms of whether funds will be available to conduct regular business from year to year, including in particular, library resources for specific programs. The traditional 4-4 and 4-4-1 teaching load for faculty seems excessive given the absence of load credit for administrative responsibilities, masters advising, and directing masters projects and theses. The move to university status and the changes reflected in the new tenure and

promotion policy which went into effect in 1998-99 has served to increase the expectations for faculty research, however, there has been no offsetting move to factor this into the work load expectations. The School of Education is receiving strong support through the addition of new faculty and the plan for a new school of education facility that will be built in approximately two to three years. This facility will address the addition of office space, classroom space, and the media and technology for up to date instruction.

Strengths

- The inclusion in the Capital Campaign of a new building to house education in the near future is a tremendous commitment on the part of the university. This will alleviate some space problems that have resulted from the increase of programs, students, and faculty at CBU.
- Faculty salaries have been significantly increased in recent years.

Concerns

- The facility that houses the education offices and classrooms has an elevator that does not always function. This results in inconvenience and some awkwardness for students with handicaps.
- The team is concerned about the level of resources allocated for program administration. Faculty members are expected to serve as program coordinators without receiving a teaching load reduction.

Standard 3: Faculty

Standard Met

The Education Division employs 11 full time faculty along with a number of adjunct faculty who teach and assist with supervising field placements. Faculty members are selected on the basis of professional qualifications and experience along with the criteria for faculty employment at CBU. Adjunct faculty is hired by the Academic Vice President following recommendation by the respective program directors and the department and division chairs. Full time faculty members are universally praised for being well prepared, dedicated, accessible and concerned for the well being and success of their students.

Strengths

- Faculty members have earned universal respect from students, graduates and employers for being able to combine high demand with caring and for their commitment to helping students succeed. Students report appreciation for being known personally by faculty.
- There is an annual faculty retreat that includes adjunct faculty and that helps to maintain connection with the university and helps establish community.
- Faculty is academically well qualified with outstanding knowledge of their subject matter.

Concerns

- The faculty lacks cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity.

Standard 4: Evaluation**Standard Minimally Met
With Quantitative Concerns**

There are systematic methods for collecting data on the multiple subject, single subject, and special education programs from those students completing the program and from the students' employers. The student evaluations are given credence by the administration and faculty as demonstrated by the changes made to professional courses and field experiences. There are, however, concerns about the collection and utilization of some evaluative data. While the administrative program has an advisory committee, other programs have no formalized mechanisms that provide for professional practitioners and diverse community members to become involved in program design, development and evaluation activities. Also, there needs to be more systematic use of data collection from practitioners for some programs. In many instances this appears to be on an informal level. As a result some practitioners and adjuncts do not have an understanding of the whole program which can result in poor advice and communication with students.

Strengths

- Content of courses has changed as a result of feedback from students. This indicates that student suggestions are important for making changes.

Concerns

None noted

Standard 5: Admissions**Standard Met**

Admissions criteria and the processes for making admissions decisions are clear and well defined. Multiple measures are used for determining admissibility including individual and human characteristics deemed important for success as a professional educator. Each applicant's file is reviewed by the education faculty sitting as a group and decisions to admit are made jointly. Admissions decisions reflect CBU's commitment to an ethnically, culturally and socio-economically diverse student body including their policy to admit up to 15% of students who lack one or more admission criteria.

Strengths

- Several students and former students have commended the university for nurturing students who don't meet all qualifications for admission but have other unique qualities that enable them to make a significant contribution to the profession.

Concerns

None noted

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance**Standard Met**

Faculty members are highly praised for their accessibility and responsiveness to students. Faculty members know their students on a personal level and as a result of this relationship students feel that they can succeed at CBU. In the past there has been some unevenness in the quality of advising candidates. This has been rectified with hiring of new staff for advisement. Many students praise the quality of advisement.

Strengths

- Faculty members are to be commended for their tremendous caring and commitment to their students.

Concerns

- None noted

Standard 7: School Collaboration**Standard Met**

The university has developed the necessary collaborative relationships with schools and school districts to provide opportunity for students to participate in a well planned sequence of professional field experiences

Strengths:

- None noted

Concerns:

- Informal relationships have not been institutionalized so that they will continue beyond the tenure of individual faculty who have developed them.

Standard 8: Field Supervision**Standard Met**

The institution supports field supervisors through modest stipends and allows them to take a three unit course at CBU. There is a dinner to honor outstanding teachers in the community. Some of those honored have been master teachers. Others have not been associated with CBU but are asked by faculty to become involved in the credential program as master teachers. There is a prescribed procedure for orienting master teachers, student teachers and the university supervisors before students begin their practice teaching, however it appears that this procedure is not followed consistently. A few master teachers who were interviewed indicated that they had not participated in such a process.

Strengths:

- University supervisors visit weekly, make telephone calls and receive high praise from master teachers for their accessibility and responsiveness.

Concerns:

- None noted

Program Standards

Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis Single Subject CLAD Emphasis

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional self-study and supporting documentation as well as completion of interviews of candidates, faculty, graduates, employers and supervising practitioners, the team finds all general program standards are met in the multiple-subject, multiple-subject with CLAD Emphasis, single subject, and single subject with CLAD Emphasis programs.

Strengths:

The team found the faculty to be well-qualified, extremely dedicated and committed to the programs.

Students consistently commented on the high degree of professionalism, support and accessibility of the faculty.

The team found the curriculum to be extremely well designed and coordinated. The program is balanced between theory and practice.

All courses in the program included significant and relevant field work.

Graduates from the programs are highly sought after by local districts.

Master teachers consistently stated that student teachers came to their assignments very well prepared.

Education Specialist Level I Credential Program Mild/Moderate

Findings on Standards

The Education Specialist Level I Mild/Moderate Program meets all of the prescribed standards. After reviewing documents and conducting numerous interviews, the team determined that this program is highly regarded by students, adjunct faculty, field supervisors and employers. In fact, graduates expressed a highly personal level of gratitude to faculty and staff for their support. Additionally, graduates consistently expressed that they are well prepared for their teaching roles and responsibilities and that sentiment was echoed in the interviews with field supervisors and employers. Consequently, the team determined that all standards are fully met.

Strengths

The Special Education Program is to be commended for its caring atmosphere, supportive guidance, consistent feedback to students, responsiveness to student needs, and strong inter-program collaboration. The program is designed on current best practice models in special education and includes a high level of practical content.

Students and graduates expressed unanimous recognition of the dedicated hard work that the faculty extends to the program.

Concerns

The team recognizes that this is a new credential program still in the early stages of development. Systematizing many of the processes and activities of the program will allow for enrollment growth and program expansion. It is also recognized by the team that a small core of faculty is now carrying the heavy burden of this demanding program.

Concerns were expressed by the team in the area of student teaching. The reduced time for special education student teaching for dual credential candidates may not provide them with the necessary amount of guided and supervised special education experiences. Also, it is important to maintain field site criteria regardless of individual student circumstance.

Administrative Services Credential Program

Findings on Standards

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program at CBU meets all prescribed standards as outlined by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

This newly-formed and approved program offers a rigorous, comprehensive course of study that prepares entry-level administrators for successful induction into the world of work. All evidence indicates a good balance between theory and the practical application of necessary skills in the workplace. The faculty members are highly qualified current or recent public school practitioners. An Advisory Council composed of practicing school administrators in the area gives ongoing valuable input for the

improvement of the program. Fieldwork is planned to support the candidates' need to have a variety of administrative experiences supervised by competent, current administrators.

Strengths

- The faculty and staff are to be commended for creating a productive, hands-on approach to administrator training and for providing an extraordinary level of personal and professional support for their students. Individual attention to candidate needs is clearly evident throughout the program.

Concerns

None noted.

Professional Comments

Common Standards

- The programs in education are growing at a very rapid rate and the existing organizational structures do not yet appear to have evolved to reflect the university status. It may be that the time has come to consider a new administrative structure that could include a Dean of the School of Education and more clear definitions of departmental, and within-department, program structures and administrative responsibilities.
- The university should provide email accounts to all students as a way of enhancing communication.
- Implementation of a BTSA project would allow the education department to develop a more active partnership with schools or a consortium of schools. This would enhance the preparation of teachers from the credential program through their initial years of teaching. This has been a valuable experience for many higher education institutions. It will also make the California Standards for the Teaching Profession more evident in their preparation program.
- With the number of students currently on emergency permits the university is strongly urged to consider establishing an internship program which will also promote collaboration with school districts.
- All education programs should be encouraged to develop advisory committees or other formal structures that can give input that will help shape their educational programs.
- The new education building will enhance the efficiency of the education programs.
- Faculty members who feel overloaded should not be teaching extra courses.
- Some of the evening students have complained about the lack of services for evening students, such as extended hours for the book store and other university services.
- More mechanisms need to be developed to formalize collaborative relationships with schools and school districts.
- In order to increase diversity adjunct faculty other than CBU graduates should be cultivated and recruited.

Multiple and Single Subject

Given the number of candidates completing the program who are on emergency credentials, CBU might consider establishing internship programs.

A formal advisory committee would assist the department in assessing needs and making improvements in the program.

Many students are admitted to the multiple-subjects and single-subject programs who are already employed as full time teachers and complete the program “on the job”. Several of these students expressed the opinion that some of the observations and field experiences required in the pre-student teaching coursework are similar to experiences they encounter in their jobs. Since the amount of observation and field work in the program is extensive, and completing these requirements while working full time is difficult, CBU might consider substituting “on the job” experience for some of the required observations or field work.

Education Specialist

The team recognizes the exceptionally high level of commitment to the program on the part of the program administrator. Incorporating broader participation through the creation of an advisory council consisting of community professionals, parents and individuals with disabilities would serve to extend program visibility, strength, and support. Additionally, tapping into the expertise of adjunct faculty in contributing to all facets of the program (including program development) would increase the strength of the Education Specialist Program. This could be accomplished by establishing program faculty meetings in which adjuncts could participate. This involvement would ensure that all adjunct faculty are connected to program changes as well as up-to-date information in the field of special education.

Administrative Services

Consider including additional research experiences in course or fieldwork, particularly in using disaggregated data to make decisions about school programs and processes. Candidates need to be prepared to analyze their school programs by fact and explain these facts and trends coherently to their constituencies.

Establish a Tier II program with a possibility of an earned Doctorate in Educational Leadership. A comprehensive program of administrator training at CBU will promote long-term candidate interest in the program and provide additional support for school districts in the Inland Empire as they continue to recruit qualified administrative candidates.

There is at present a workable set of procedures for evaluation and communication which are informal in nature. As programs grow, a more formal set of procedures will better serve the department.

Care should be taken not to lose the “personal touch” and a sense of community with faculty, staff and students as procedures are institutionalized and programs grow.